DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 687 RC 016 255

AUTHOR Fenton, Ray; Nancarrow, Douglas
TITLE When Good Will Isn't Enough. Prejudice and Racism: Reactions to a Multicultural Unit on Alaska Native Land Claims.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-18, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alaska Natives; American Indians; Communication Skills; Cultural Education; Culture Conflict; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Problems; Grade 11; *Multicultural Education; Negative Attitudes; Program Implementation; *Racial Bias; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teacher Role; Units of Study
IDENTIFIERS Alaska; Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act 1972; Anchorage School District AK; *Land Claims; *Teacher Knowledge

ABSTRACT

Failure to take into account the need to train teachers to deal with prejudicial statements and negative racial attitudes contributed to the failure of a 2-week unit on Alaska Native Land Claims designed for inclusion in an 11th grade American Government course in the Anchorage (Alaska) School District. The unit--recommended by a parent group and supported by the superintendent and board of education--was developed jointly by a teacher expert in Alaska history and the Indian Education Program Curriculum specialist in consultation with various Alaska Native groups and curriculum committees. Evaluations of the unit showed that it met its goal of increasing student knowledge, but students' prejudiced reactions reported by teachers indicated the need for further review of the unit. The unit review showed, first, that education is not neutral and value free. Any lessons about current culture and current events which are tied to cultural differences will involve the racial attitudes that exist in the society. The probable behaviors of students must be considered and teachers must be prepared to deal with prejudicial statements. Second, a quick way to fail to integrate multicultural materials into the curriculum is to mandate that the materials be used without working closely with teachers. (JHZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282687

JUN 1987
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Prejudice and Racism: Reactions to a Multicultural Unit on Alaska Native Land Claims

WHEN GOOD WILL ISN'T ENOUGH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ray Fenton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, 1986).

Dr. Ray Fenton, Research Associate
Assessment and Evaluation
Anchorage School District
(907)269-2211

Dr. Douglas Nancarrow, Chair
Communication Arts
Alaska Pacific University
(907) 564-8219

RC016255

WHEN GOOD WILL ISN'T ENOUGH:

Abstract

A paper prepared for the Multicultural Communications Interest Group of the Western Speech Communication Association. This paper recounts the failure to successfully implement a required two week unit on Alaska Native Land Claims in an American Government course in the Anchorage School District. It relates the planning and effort involved and the hopes which were not fulfilled. It reports on the outcome of the pilot test of the unit and the negative consequences of a failure to take into account the need to train teachers in the communication skills needed to deal with prejudicial statements and negative racial attitudes. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of reducing prejudice in the classroom.

Alaska Native Land Claims is an important issue in the State of Alaska. Alaska was purchased by the United States of America in 1867 and became the property of the federal government. Since 1884 the actual ownership of the land and the rights of the aboriginal peoples of Alaska have been unresolved issues. In 1971, the national need for Alaska oil and the desire to settle land disputes that were holding up the construction of the Alaska oil pipeline led to a wide support for the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). There are now three major land owners in Alaska: the United States Government, the State of Alaska and Alaska local governments, and the aboriginal peoples of Alaska as represented by thirteen corporations created by ANCSA.

The Anchorage School District set out to develop a unit on Alaska Native Land Claims which would create greater interpersonal understanding among students and assist Native and non-Native students in preparing to take an active role in Alaska life. In 1991 the ownership of the thirteen Native corporations which own and control about 43.7 million acres throughout the state will go public. Alaska Natives will be able to sell their shares in the corporations to non-Natives.

There are tensions which exist among the various cultural groups in Alaska. Native people feel that their right to use and enjoy the land and their cultural heritage are under attack. Non-Native Alaskans and Natives push for more economic development, more government services, universal public education, and a life style that is consistent with contemporary American values. Further, many non-Native people now openly question the assertions of Native people that they should have special rights within the state. In regard to land use, this issue is now often referred to as "Native Sovereignty."

Anchorage is sometimes called as the largest Native village in Alaska. While only eight percent of the approximately one quarter of a million people who live in Anchorage are Alaska Native. This is the largest single concentration of Native people in the state (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1984). During the 1983-84 school year about seven percent of the 42,000 students enrolled in Anchorage schools were Alaska Native: Eskimo, Aleut, or American Indian. This group of about 3,200 students is a visible minority and constitutes the largest single group of Native students enrolled in any one location in Alaska.

The Anchorage schools have recognized the role of Native people in Alaska with an active Indian Education Program which provides instructional and cultural enrichment activities for both Native and non-Native students. Most students are exposed to classroom demonstrations by Native artists and artisans each year. There is also an active Multicultural Education Program which has been providing training for teachers, materials for classroom use, and oversight of the curriculum to insure that the diversity of the local population is reflected in the classroom.

Much of this motivation for this extensive effort to make Alaska Native life and culture a part of the student experience in Anchorage has grown from the knowledge that prejudice has affected the performance of Native students and that Native students sometimes find school a less than friendly place (Klienfield, 1978). A recent report from the University of

Alaska - Fairbanks presented to educators at the 1985 Alaska Small Schools Conference reported that fewer than 4 percent of the Native students in the state would finish college. A 1983 study within the Anchorage School District identified prejudice and a feeling of not belonging as primary reasons for Native students leaving school (Fenton, 1982).

There has been a long history of successful curriculum development which has given Alaska Native culture a place in the regular curriculum of Anchorage. It has been recognized for some time that commercially available materials do not give Alaska Natives much of a place in day to day lessons. Because of this, social studies units have been developed for Anchorage schools on Alaska Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut life. Most of the units have been developed by Anchorage Indian Education Act Program staff with the support of other specialists. Other materials including films and video tapes are readily available through the District audio visual department.

The Anchorage commitment to Multicultural Education was shown in a variety of instructional activities during 1983-84. There were a number of three to six week units on Alaska Native life in use in Anchorage. In grade four units on Tlingit and Athabascan life stressed traditional means of transportation and communication. A sixth grade unit looked at Aleut life and culture. A third grade unit looked at rural economics and life in the Eskimo village of Unalakleet in Western Alaska. The annual evaluation of the Anchorage Indian Education Act Program in Anchorage for 1983-84 reported that more than 7,200 students had been exposed to these units and 8,500 had been exposed to other films and video tapes on Native American topics.[1]

A special week was set aside in Anchorage as "Native Emphasis Week" during which each school did something special to celebrate Native Culture. Many schools had performances by Native artists and there were demonstrations of Native sports. During the entire year, there were more than 670 presentations by Native artists, artisans, and story tellers to more than 3,900 students.

The idea of an Alaska Native Land Claims unit had been discussed as a positive addition to the multicultural curriculum for a number of years by teachers and members of the Native community. A full semester elective social studies course at the high school level was introduced in the mid-1970s. It has been offered with success for more than five years on an occasional basis in at least four Anchorage high schools.

Secondary social studies teachers indicated that there was a need for more treatment of the history, geography, geology, and economic conditions of the State of Alaska. The Social Studies Curriculum Committee twice recommended that the high school curriculum be expanded to include required courses in Alaska history and government. It was against this background of need, interest, and a history of successful locally developed units on Native culture that an Alaska Land Claims unit was formally proposed.

---

1 Information of these materials is available from Pat Partnow, Indian Education Program Curriculum Specialist, Anchorage School District, 4600 DeBarr Road, Anchorage, Alaska. Phone: 907-269-2311

In the winter of 1982 the Anchorage School Board meet with a committee of parents of high school students to discuss a School District study which showed that Alaska Native and American Indian students frequently left school prior to graduation. Among the recommendations made by the parents to improve the schools for Native students was the development of a unit on Alaska Native Land Claims for all high school students. The parents felt that increased knowledge of the current Native issues would improve the status of Native students.

The Superintendent of schools then identified the development of a unit on Alaska Native Land Claims as a district priority. He requested that the unit be developed by the District Curriculum Development Department. The Indian Education Program Curriculum Specialists who had developed proven elementary units on Native culture were told to concentrate on the development of materials related to Alaska Native Land Claims. A contract was made with a secondary social studies teacher who had developed a successful semester course on Alaska Native Land Claims and was expert in Alaska history to develop the final unit jointly with the Indian Education Program Curriculum Specialist.

The Social Studies Curriculum Committee was able to review the unit in the fall of 1983. After lengthy discussion, the committee approved a two week unit in the required U. S. Government class which would consist of nine lessons based on the history of the Alaska Native Land Claims issue, the efforts made to secure passage of the act, the formation of the thirteen Alaska Native Corporations to hold the assets of Alaska Natives, and the prospects for Alaska Natives when ownership in the corporations becomes public in 1991. Representatives of Alaska Native Corporations and community groups reviewed and gave their support to the proposed unit. The School Board approved $7,500 to support a pilot test of the unit in all eleventh grade American Government classes in the spring semester of 1983.

The only groups who had not been directly consulted were the students who would be exposed to the unit and the U. S. Government teachers who would be asked to fit the two week unit into their courses. It was assumed that teacher support was a given because of the long history of social studies teachers working to develop an increased emphasis on Alaska studies in the schools. Little thought was given to the reactions of students because of the positive reactions to the elementary units on Native culture.

The final unit as approved by the School Board called for the use of a combination of activities, lectures, readings, and other materials. The Indian Education program staff even developed a speaker's bureau made up of Native community members who were active in the effort to pass ANCSA or who were now playing active roles in the Native corporations created by the act. Chart I shows a general outline of the unit with the activities and alternatives suggested for each day.

CHART I

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS UNIT

DAY	CONTENT	ACTIVITY	MATERIALS
1	Introduction to Alaska Land Ownership	Discussion View Video	Video Tape Handout
2	Historical Background	Lecture Worksheet	Readings Slides Poster Worksheet
3	Land Claims Planning	Group Activity Worksheet	Worksheet
4	Organizing/Lobbying	View Video - Part I Worksheet	Video Tape Worksheet
5	Organizing/Lobbying	View Video - Part II Discussion	Video Tape Readings

CHART I

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS UNIT

DAY	CONTENT	ACTIVITY	MATERIALS
6	Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act	Lecture (Movie option) Discussion Writing Assignment	Readings Overheads Handout Chart
7	Corporations Land Settlement	Lecture Discussion Writing Assignment	Readings Overheads
8	Discussion/Review	Worksheet Writing Assignment Discussion	Worksheet
9	Writing Assignment Test	Discussion Test Evaluation	Test Evaluation Questionnaire

A 63 page Teacher's Guide was developed to accompany the unit. It included suggested outlines of lectures, sources of information, material to make overheads, worksheets, tests and questionnaires. The Guide also included brief discussions of the materials and ordering information for movies. Books and other sources of background information were identified. Video tapes and booklets of student readings were provided in kits prepared for each school.

The Teacher's Guide pointed out that the unit outline was a suggestion and that teachers were free to change the order of lessons or make improvisations. It noted that there was a speaker's bureau of people who had actually been involved in the passage of ANCSA and members of Native corporations and encouraged a call to the Indian Education program to schedule a speaker.

All of the materials were reviewed and passed by the parent committee which had recommended the creation of the unit. The Social Studies Curriculum Committee, the Indian Education Act Program Advisory Committee, and the Multicultural Education Advisory Committee were all provided with outlines of the completed unit for review. The Social Studies Curriculum Committee minutes show that the discussion following a presentation of the unit to the group was positive but that some committee members were now concerned about the length of the unit. They now felt that a two or three day unit would be more appropriate to the course since that. It should be made clear to teachers that the new materials were to supplant an existing unit on lobbying efforts.

Members of the parent committees on the other hand felt that there was too much to cover in too short a time and that even more time should be given to the unit, perhaps as much as six weeks. Reviewers from the Native community who had participated in the Alaska Native Land Claims settlement found the final unit acceptable and made positive comments about the quality of the materials.

The developers of the unit had high hopes as the actual classroom test approached. The Indian Education Curriculum Specialist, Social Studies Curriculum Specialist, and other members of the Staff Development Department saw to the production of an adequate supply of Teacher's Guides, video tapes, and other materials. An in-service meeting was scheduled for the presentation of the materials to the U. S. Government teachers and the social studies department heads. Teachers were given released time from class to participate in the in-service and substitute teachers were hired to cover their classes.

The superintendent of schools started the in-service meeting with a declaration that the Alaska Native Land Claims unit was a critical addition to the social studies program. He indicated that it was supported by the school board and the Native community. He referred to the cost of the development of the unit, the quality of the materials, and the expectation that the unit would improve inter-cultural relations.

The developers of the curriculum reviewed the unit with the teachers, previewed a video tape, discussed the content of the act, and had the faculty from each school discuss how they might best implement the unit. A representative from the district Assessment and Evaluation Department briefly described the evaluation of the unit. Volunteers agreed to administer a pre-test of student knowledge prior to the start of the unit.

Teachers raised questions about the suitability of materials for low level students, how an additional two week unit could be added to their courses, and the fact that Alaska Native Land Claims was a very specialized topic which had little to do with what was covered as part of the U. S. Government class. It was clear that the teachers as a group had some reservations about the implementation of the Native Land Claims unit and the amount of time it was going to take away from other U. S. Government lessons.

At the end of the meeting the authors of the curriculum, and the program evaluator had a brief discussion of the days events while cleaning the black board, straightening the chairs, and picking up discarded papers and curriculum outlines. They were a little nervous about the reception of the curriculum materials by the teachers for the response was less enthusiastic than expected. The author of the curriculum said he felt that ANCSA was an excellent example of a successful lobbying effort. The curriculum specialist author offered to visit each of the schools to encourage the teachers to give the curriculum a fair try.

In the week following the in-service, the curriculum specialist distributed additional materials to teachers, visited teachers who had not been able to attend the in-service, and reviewed the evaluations of the in-service with the program evaluator. Lack of familiarity with Alaska history, Alaska issues, and specifically the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act were all mentioned by teachers as personal concerns. Some teachers indicated on the questionnaire that they only had time to spend two to three days on special interest groups and lobbying efforts. Few of the teachers answered indicated when they intended to teach the Alaska Native Land Claims unit.

After the review of the in-service evaluations, it was decided that the curriculum specialist would visit each school and ask teachers to provide a schedule of when the unit would be taught. The curriculum specialist and program evaluator would then make at least two classroom visits at each school to get a first hand look at how the materials and lessons worked and talk to students and teachers about the unit.

The program evaluator and curriculum specialist met and developed an interview protocol to be used with teachers. They agreed to schedule observations prior to teacher preparation periods when possible, to observe and note class activities, and to ask teachers a set series of questions, and to talk with students when possible. It was felt that major flaws with materials would be identified at this point and that further development of lessons and materials would take place as rapidly as possible to adapt the unit to take into account teachers' feelings prior to a final review of the curriculum following the pilot test.

Appointments were scheduled at all high schools. Most of the teachers picked for classroom visits were selected because they were known by the curriculum specialist to be positive or neutral in their feelings toward the curriculum. It was felt that these teachers would be most likely to give the materials a fair classroom test and not cover up or exagerate problems with the unit. Visits were scheduled with teachers of both remedial and honors classes. More than one visit was scheduled at each school.

There were some signs of trouble. One observed teacher on the second day of the unit assigned the students all two weeks of readings and said, "there will be a test over this material on Friday and there won't be time to talk about this." He later said that he did not have time for a nine day unit, so he was compressing days four through seven into one day and did not plan any review prior to the test. One teacher quit on lesson four, another teacher gave a rapid lecture on the background of the act and gave the writing assignments without any class discussion. When asked about the lack of discussion she said, "Some of the class members had voiced anti-Native attitudes on the first day of the unit and I did not want to deal with their prejudice."

Another class was observed on day 3 of the unit which is set aside for a group discussion and project to plan a lobbying effort. A group of male students in the back of the room struck up a loud conversation which was obviously meant to be overheard. They discussed their feelings that Natives had unfair advantages due to State subsistence hunting and fishing laws. They asserted that Natives did little work, wasted meat and destroyed the environment, and did not deserve to be paid for Alaska lands to which they had no rightful claim. The teacher ignored the group and worked quietly at her desk. When asked later about why she did not discipline the students and get them back on their assigned task, the teacher said, "They are a group of trouble makers. I did not want to get into an argument with them in front of the class."

Another teacher commented that she was lucky to have Native students in her class. She said that their presence "cut down on prejudiced statements." She said that the Native students directly confronted assertions that they had been made rich by the ANCSA but that there was still some resentment shown by other students who felt that the settlement unfairly gave land to Natives. She lamented the fact that the students were not knowledgable of the true situation and felt that teachers at lower grades should do more to combat ignorance and prejudice.

Another teacher commented that he was pleased that the observed class went well. He said that in an earlier class he had been forced to leave class with two students to reprimand them for making prejudiced statements and making derogatory comments about Native classmates. He felt at a loss for things that he could do in class to reduce prejudice. He said that he had never had to directly confront prejudicial statements in class and did not know what to say to other students when he returned to the class room.

At one school, the Assessment and Evaluation specialist was invited to join a group of social studies teachers for lunch. The teachers had decided that they as a group wanted to share some observations about the unit. It turned out that their observations were that students on the whole did not have much background knowledge of Alaska Native issues, the role of Native Americans in the United States, or the history of Native people in Alaska. They also felt that it was not their job to confront prejudicial statements. They felt the inclusion of the Alaska Native Land Claims Unit was inflaming student prejudice. Most felt that they as teachers did not have specific training in changing attitudes or handling prejudice in class discussions. Some felt that more emphasis should be placed on Alaska history and culture when students were in elementary school to avoid the development of prejudice.

When the observations and interviews were completed, the Indian Education Program curriculum development specialist and Assessment and Evaluation Department program evaluator realized that the pilot was in substantial trouble. First, while most teachers were following the letter of the law by including the required unit as an example of a lobbying effort they were often shortening the unit to one week or less. Second, some of the teachers were not making use of the video tape and film materials because of the difficulty in getting equipment and poor quality of the sound on one of the video tapes. Third, the class observations showed that students were less than enthusiastic - perhaps a reflection of their teacher's attitude. Fourth, teachers were reporting that the discussion of the Alaska Native Land Claims issue was provocative and resulted in the revelation of racist attitudes and negative statements by students with which a number of the teachers were not prepared to cope.

A short interim report was prepared for the Social Studies Curriculum Committee. Discussions were held with the social studies curriculum specialist, director of curriculum development, and director of staff development. It was recommended that the pilot be continued because it was near completion in most schools but that future implementation be undertaken with care.

The curriculum developers decided that in-service training must be developed to prepare teachers for the prejudice which they might meet in their classrooms. It was agreed that the unit would be reviewed in depth by the curriculum committee prior to the development of a recommendation for inclusion of the unit and the problem of provoking prejudice carefully considered. It was also decided that all of the teachers who taught the unit would be brought together in another in-service to further examine the questions raised about the unit by the class room observations and interviews.

As the unit was concluded, teachers began to return evaluation materials. The materials included copies of student pre and post tests which asked about knowledge of ANCSA, the lobbying efforts which led up to the act, the land distribution which resulted from the act, and the prospects for Native corporations when they would become public corporations open to non-Native ownership. There were also brief questionnaires on each one of the lessons and related assignments, audio-visual materials, reading materials, and work sheets. The returns were slow in coming.

Of the 32 teachers who had taught one or more sections of the Alaska Native Land Claims unit, only 14 (43 percent) finally returned all evaluation materials. Most returned the tests taken by students though a handful said they rejected the tests because they were too hard or because there was not enough time to give a test. Some said that the vocabulary used in the tests was too difficult even though the terms mentioned as difficult were taken directly from the newspaper articles which made up the student readings.

Eight classes had been given pre-tests. The final test given at the end of the unit included all pre-test items as well as some specific questions related to text and video tape materials which were not generally available outside the class. One class was excluded from the pre-post analysis because student answers on the post test were so similar in content that it was reasonable to think that the test had been given as an open book test or answered by the students working together as a group. Tests from 13 classes were examined for pre-post differences.

The average score on the pre-test items ranged from 0 percent to 84 percent correct. The same items on the post-test ranged from 44 percent to 100 percent correct. The average gain on individual items ranged from 14 percent to 75 percent with an overall average gain of just over 40 percent. Only two of the text or tape specific questions included on the final exam had an average percent correct of less than the 75 percent which was considered mastery for a class.

The test scores showed that the students in classes where the teacher had volunteered to give the pre-test had learned a great deal about Alaska Native Land Claims. The greatest gains were on those items which related to material covered both in the readings and in class discussion or on video tape. The items covered during days 1-6 had greater gains than the materials associated with days 7 and 8. The items which showed the least gain were those which related to material presented only on video tape. Class to class differences on the video tape items reflected the decision of some teachers not to show the video tape associated with the lobbying effort.

Teachers were asked to rate the individual elements of each days lesson. They were given a questionnaire for each lesson at the time of the first in-service and asked to write down their reaction to each lesson when they completed it. Few of the teachers bothered to complete all of the evaluation instruments. Some indicated that they had not completed the average ratings because they reorganized the materials, did not use significant parts of the materials, or just did not think that their opinion made any difference because the unit was being mandated from above. These personal comments may have told us more than the actual ratings presented to Table 1 which show that all unit elements other than video tapes were rated above the 2.5 mid-point on a good-bad scale.

TABLE 1

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS
EVALUATION 1983-84

TEACHER EVALUATION OF MATERIALS

Activities	Used?	Your Rating (1-5) Bad-Good	Your perception of student's response (1-5) Bad-Good
Day 1			
1. Readings (pp. 1-5)	14	3.5	3.1
2. Discussion, Land Ownership	12	3.7	3.5
3. Legal precedents VT	5	2.0	2.1
4. Discuss p. 6 in readings	10	3.8	3.7
5. Homework: pp. 7-10	9	3.3	2.8
Day 2			
1. Lecture: History Backgrounds	9	3.8	3.8
2. Homework: Readings	8	3.0	3.1
3. Homework: Worksheet I	7	3.7	3.7
Day 3			
1. Group Activity: Planning	7	3.0	3.3
2. Homework: Readings	7	3.5	3.2
3. Homework: Worksheet II	7	4.0	3.8
Day 4			
1. Perry "Live"	3	4	4
2. Videotape: Perry Eaton	4	1.5	2
3. Homework: Readings	3	3.5	2.3
4. Homework: Worksheet III	5	3.8	2.8

TABLE 2
(continued)

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS
EVALUATION 1983-84

TEACHER EVALUATION OF MATERIALS

Activities	Used?	Your Rating (1-5) Bad-Good	Your perception of student's response (1-5) Bad-Good
Day 5			
1. Conclusion of videotape 2. Discussion of homework	2	3	
Day 6			
1. Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (NCSA)	11	3.8	3.8
2. Reading	9	3.8	3.7
Day 7			
1. Corporation	9	4.2	4.2
2. Angapak "Live"	1	4	4
3. Corporation Structure	5	3.7	4.3
4. Reading	3	4.0	5
Day 8			
1. Worksheet IV	2	3	5
2. Review for Test	3	5	5
3. Written assignment	4	5	4.7
Day 9			
1. Presentation of papers or discussion	1	4	4
2. Test	9	2.8	2.9

If the unit had been evaluated only on the basis of test results and teachers ratings of materials alone, it might have been accepted because it did meet its goal of increasing student knowledge. But the prejudiced reactions reported by teachers during the classroom visits and the suggestion that the materials would produce adverse reactions in some students led to the allocation of funds to bring the teachers back together to discuss their experience and develop a recommendation for inclusion in the final evaluation of the pilot test.

Most of the participating teachers, 24, came to the half day debriefing meeting. Substitute teachers were again hired to cover classes and there was an enticing promise that a low cost but high calorie lunch would be provided.

The discussion proved to be spirited. Groups went right to the task of reworking the Alaska Land Claims unit and general discussion of what place the unit should have in high school social studies. After about an hour of talk, most of the groups came to a conclusion. The conclusions of the groups were remarkably similar.

1. The land claims unit did not fit well into the existing U. S. Government class as an example of a lobbying effort. It was too much material with too broad an objective to be used as a mere example.

2. The material could be presented if a more modular approach was taken with various parts of the unit presented within various classes. For example, the historical aspects of Alaska Native Land Claims would be better treated as part of the required U. S. History class.

3. The material was difficult for many students because they had very little background in Alaska culture and little knowledge of Alaska history. Many had no idea that there was such a thing as Alaska Native Land Claims prior to the topics introduction in class.

4. Teachers should be given more choice in what they teach and what they have to test.

5. A variety of specific suggestions were made for improvement in materials, lesson outlines, and video tapes.

None of the groups suggested that there was any problem in dealing with prejudice or that there was a need to provide teachers with training to deal with problems which arise from prejudicial statements on the part of students. When the groups had finished presenting their suggestions for revisions, the evaluator asked if there had been any problems due to student attitudes or prejudicial statements. There was a moment of silence followed by a flood of comments. At least one person in each of the groups recounted personal problems. Teachers started to exchange reports of what had happened in their classes and what they had or had not done about it.

After a short discussion. There was an almost immediate consensus that an item should be added to the list of recommendations that some sort of "human relations training" be added for teachers with specific strategies to use in responding to prejudiced statements.

The Assessment and Evaluation Department prepared a report on the pilot project which identified the mixed results of the try-out. The materials were found to be of acceptable quality with the exception of the video tapes. Student knowledge gains were presented as an indication that when the unit was really taught students came to know more about the land claims issue. It was recommended that the Social Studies Curriculum Committee and the school board reconsider the placement of the unit in the U. S. Government class. It was recommended that the video tapes be revised and improved in quality. It was recommended that the unit not be offered unless teachers had had prior training in how to handle prejudice and prejudicial statements made by students. The unit was discontinued.

In retrospect it seems almost foolish that the consequences of open discussion of Alaska Native Land Claims and ANSCA were treated as neutral topics which were value free. The prejudice and anti-Native statements provoked in students might have been expected if the developers had not had such positive initial support from teachers and the community and such a positive response from teachers and students when elementary units had been introduced on various Alaska Native cultural groups. The reaction of students has led to a consideration of what can be done to confront prejudice in the classrooms and make the schools a friendly place for all students.

CONCLUSIONS

There is ample evidence that attitudes can be modified through education. Alaska Native Land Claims and the role of the Alaska Native are not unique. There have been similar units developed for use in the public schools that have proved successful in Canada and have had the desired effect of moving toward an integrated and understanding multicultural society.

The attempt to implement a unit on Alaska Native Land Claims reported here had two startling outcomes in the view of the curriculum developers. First, education is not neutral and value free. Any lessons about current culture and current events which are tied to cultural differences can not be done without bringing into the classroom the racial attitudes that exist in the society. The probable behaviors of students must be considered and teachers must be prepared to deal with prejudicial statements. (See also Boyer, 83 and Klopf, 79)

Second, a quick way to fail in the attempt to integrate multicultural materials into the curriculum is to mandate that the materials be inserted into already existing classes without working closely with teachers and considering the impact of the materials on the whole course. (see also, Banks, 1984)

The authors came to a number of conclusions about what could be done to confront and reduce the manifestation of prejudice in the classroom. None of the following suggestions will eliminate prejudice as an individual predisposition to think and act negative on the basis of ethnic or cultural group identification. They should however work toward the elimination of prejudice through increasing cultural understanding and providing reinforcement, positive and negative, for various behaviors in the classroom.

1) Continue an integrated development of a multicultural curriculum with an emphasis on the role of native people in the day-to-day life of Alaska.

2) Expand the use of role playing and experimental units at all grade levels to provoke positive images and a positive understanding of native life and traditional native values.

3) Expand the use of native artists and story tellers and "Native Emphasis Week" activities and introduce more non-traditional Natives who are successful in business and government as positive role models.

4) Expand the opportunity for teachers to learn about Alaska culture and multicultural education through the expansion of existing inservice training opportunities.

5) Provide teachers with specific inservice training in strategies to confront and correct prejudicial statements and behaviors and practice in dealing with prejudicial statements.

None of the suggestions is beyond the scope of what a school district can do to reduce prejudice and racism. In Anchorage, there are already resources available to implement the suggestions since the two local universities, Alaska Pacific University and the University of Alaska, Anchorage, already offer courses in intercultural education and communication. The school district now has more than 20 teachers who have had special training to work with school faculty groups on multicultural education. There is also a statewide effort to develop curriculum materials and guidelines by the Alaska State Department of Education.

The front line in the effective reduction of prejudice remains the interaction between a specific teacher and a specific student. The teacher has the power to correct inaccurate statements of fact, to provoke exploration of personal values, to organize activities and situations that improve cultural understanding, and to reinforce the American cultural values of equality, personal freedom, and individual choice. The best thing which we may be able to do to combat racism and prejudice is to help the individual classroom teacher through the provision of training and materials which improve intercultural communication and understanding.

If there was one clear lesson learned from this rather frustrating example of good intentions and hard work gone wrong, it is that there is a need to

consider communication. Some of the grief and discouragement felt by teachers confronted by prejudice and prejudicial statements could have been avoided if the training of those teachers in presenting the Alaska Native Land Claims unit had anticipated student reactions and provided teachers with tools to confront and counter prejudice. All of the frustration of the various staff members who worked for more than a year to develop the unit and of the teachers who reluctantly field tested it could have been avoided if the curriculum development effort had included those who would actually be asked to teach the unit from the start.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Banks, James A. "Reducing Prejudice in Students: Theory, Research, and Strategies." Paper presented at the Kamloops Spring Institute for Teacher Education. Burnaly, British Columbia, Canada; February 1982.

Boyer, James. "Multicultural Education: From Product to Process." ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.; June 1984.

Fenton, Ray. "Early School Leavers." Anchorage School District; June 1982.

Gold, Milton J. (Ed.) and Grant, Carl A. (Ed.). "Multicultural Education: A Functional Bibliography for Teachers." Nebraska University Omaha Center for Urban Education; January 1978.

Kleinfeld, Judith. "Alaska Native Students and College Success." Fairbanks, Alaska. University of Alaska Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research; ISER Occasional Paper No. 14. June 1979.

Klopf, Donald W. "Educating Children for Communication in a Multicultural Society." Paper presented at the Conference on Developing Oral Communication Competence in Children. Armidale, Australia, July 1979.

Payne, Charles. "Multicultural Education and Racism in American Schools." Theory Into Practice; Spring 1984, v23 n2 p124-131.

Power, Donald. "Using Human Rights Cases to Teach about Prejudice and Discrimination." History and Social Science Teacher; December 1983, v19 n2 p105-108.

U. S. Department of Commerce Bureau of The Census, American Indian Areas and Alaska Native Villages: 1980. Supplimentary Report, PC80-51-13. Washington, DC; August, 1984.

Wineburg, N. Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. National Institute Education, Washington, D.C. March, 1977.

Woloshyn, S. and Sloan, L. V. "Kitaskinaw School: A Case Study in the Development of Tolerance and Understanding." Canadian Journal of Native Education; 1984, v12 n1 p47-57.